

the clergy and the gentry who formed the
Tory party were
led by the policy of James to abandon the
doctrine of non-
resistance. He concludes, as they did,
that there were
cases in which rebellion was justifiable. Yet
he never con-
siders the question in relation to the army,
but only in
relation to the nation. Admitting that
there are cases in
which a citizen is justified in resisting the
government,
are there cases in which a soldier is justified
in doing it?
He answers by a general maxim : ' Of all
the maladies
incident to the body politic, military
insubordination is
that which requires the most prompt and
drastic remedies.
If the evil be not stopped as soon as it
appears, it is certain
to spread ; and it cannot spread far without
danger to the
very vitals of the commonwealth.'¹ No one
will dispute
this, but are there no limits to military
obedience? It is
only when he is discussing the
responsibility for the
massacre of Glencoe that Macaulay touches
the question.
He says that if the soldiers are ordered to '
lay a thriving
town in ashes ' or ' shoot a whole gang of
banditti ', the
responsibility lies with the officer who gives
the order, not
with the men who obey it. The
soldiers of Captain
Campbell of Glenlyon were not to be punished
for obeying
the orders of their captain, nor was he to be
punished for

obeying the orders of Lieutenant Colonel
Hamilton. On
the other hand ' the orders given to Glenlyon
were of so
peculiar a nature that if he had been a
virtuous man, he
would have thrown up his commission, would
have braved
the displeasure of Colonel, General, and
Secretary of State,
would have incurred the highest penalty
which a court
martial would inflict, rather than have
performed the part
assigned to him/ In this case '
disobedience was as-
suredly a moral duty/ ²

¹III, 1351 (xi).

²V, 2511-2 (xxi).